

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 8 and 9 have been canceled. Claims 1-7, 10-16, 20, 21 and 25-28 are active in the case. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The present invention relates to a backprojection and/or projection screen.

Claim Amendments

Claim 1 has been amended by incorporating the limitation of Claim 9 therein. With this amendment to Claim 1, the subject matter of Claim 8 vacated. The amendment to Claim 1 is not believed to have introduced new matter into the case. Entry of the amendments into the record is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejection, 35 USC 103

Claims 1-7, 10-16, 20, 21 and 25 stand rejected based on 35 USC 102 as anticipated by Watanabe et al '840. This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

The cited patent discloses a plano lens for use in a rear projection-type of projector, as well as indeed, a screen for a rear projection-type of projector. The screen includes a plano lens having a light incident side and a light emission side and minute transparent balls disposed two-dimensionally in a single ball layer on the transparent layer. As disclosed in column 11, each transparent ball can be formed of a glass bead or a plastic bead (numbered item 12 in Figs 21-32). Each ball is a part of transparent ball disposing layer 14. However, the reference does not show or suggest the back-projection and/or projection screen which comprises a glass substrate having a scattering layer that is prepared by dispersing mineral particles selected from the group of silicon, aluminum, zirconium, titanium and cerium oxides, or a mixture of at least two of these oxides in a mineral binder. The reference does not suggest such a structure that produces a subsurface effect. Accordingly, the reference fails to

anticipate the invention as now claimed, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 8 and 9 stand rejected based on 35 USC 103 as obvious over Watanabe et al '840 in view of Bujard, '820. This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 8 has been canceled so that no further comments about the claim vis-à-vis the cited prior art are necessary.

As to the matter of Claim 9, applicants agree that the Watanabe et al patent does not suggest the features of the claim of the mineral particles being selected from the group of Si, Al, Zr, Ti and Ce oxides or a mixtures of at least two of the oxides.

As to the Bujard et al publication, a process is disclosed by which a pigmented vitreous material is made from a liquid or dissolved transition metal compound, wherein the liquid or dissolved transition metal compound reacts to form crosslinks between the liquid or dissolved transition metal atoms in the pigmented vitreous material. Paragraph [0151] of the publication shows the preparation of yellow particles in a silicon matrix, while paragraph [0153] shows the preparation of yellow particles in a titanium dioxide matrix. However, the pigmented particles of the reference are not the mineral particles used in the manufacture of the present projection screen. As stated in the first paragraph of the publication, the pigmented particles of the reference are used as coloring materials for many purposes including the coloring of the likes of beverage bottles, TV screens and other glass items. Thus, it is believed clear that the publication does not disclose light diffusing oxide particles that are used in the fabrication of back-projection and/or projection screens. Accordingly, the publication does not bring the state-of-the-art closer to the present invention. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 26 to 28 stand rejected based on 35 USC 103 as obvious over Watanabe et al '840 in view of Choi, '876. This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

Reply to the Office Action of September 18, 2008

Applicants retain their position as stated in the record above concerning the Watanabe et al patent that the reference does not teach or suggest the scope of the invention as now claimed.

Applicants submit that the cited Choi et al publication does not overcome the deficiencies of the Watanabe et al patent. Choi et al discloses a double sided image film screen in which silica particles are employed as light refracting material. As described in paragraph [0029] of the publication, a transparent material is produced in the form of a thin film made of an organic polymeric material such as a polyester, acryl or polycarbonate. Particles of silica, as the light refracting material (titania is a possible light refracting substance), are attached to the polymer material. Accordingly, the reference does not teach or suggest a small group of oxide materials in a mineral binder that constitutes the light refracting component of a projection screen. The reference therefore does not overcome or improve upon the deficiencies of Watanabe et al. Moreover, applicants enclose a certified English translation of the French priority application of the present application which has a filing date of January 13, 2003, thereby antedating the filing date of October 17, 2003 of the Choi et al publication. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.


It is believed that the application is in proper condition for allowance. Early notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
Norman F. Oblon

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)



Frederick D. Vastine, Ph.D.
Registration No. 27,013

NFO:FDV